

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated July 23, 2007. Claims 1 to 47 are pending. Claims 1 to 4, 8, and 26 to 47 stand allowed. Claims 22 and 25 have been amended. No new subject matter has been introduced by these amendments. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing.

Claims 5 and 9 to 15 were rejected under the non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,634,943. Claim 6, 7 and 16 to 21 are also rejected under the non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 17 and 18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,634,943. Applicants have submitted a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome the rejection and respectfully submit that Claims 5 to 7 and 9 to 21 are now in condition for allowance.

Claims 22 to 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. Applicants have amended Claim 22 to add further structure and to clarify that an outcome of a second game is only determined by a first outcome of a first component of a first game. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim element is now clear and the rejection has been overcome.

Claims 22 to 25 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,059,289 to Vancura ("*Vancura*"). Applicants have amended Claim 22 to further clarify the embodiment of Claim 22, and such amendment is limited to the embodiment of Claim 22. Accordingly, Claim 22 now provides a gaming device including at least one display device, at least one input device, at least one memory device, and at least one processor. The processor is configured with the display device, input device, and memory device to display: a first outcome of a first component of a first game, and a second outcome of a second component of the first game. The second outcome is different from the first outcome, and the second outcome is determined by the first outcome. The processor is also configured with the display device, input device, and memory device to display an outcome of a second game. The

second game includes at least one component not in the first game, and the second game is initiated upon at least achieving the second outcome of the second component of the first game. The outcome of the second game is only determined by an outcome of the first component of the first game.

Vancura does not disclose an outcome of a second game only determined by a first outcome of a first game as in the embodiment of Claim 22. *Vancura* discloses a primary slot machine that can trigger a secondary slot machine to play a game. The Office Action on page 9 interprets a non-bonus gaming event in the primary slot machine to be a first outcome of the first game and the bonus triggering event to be a second outcome of the first game. The Office Action seems to further suggest that the outcome of the bonus game in the secondary slot machine is the outcome of a second game.

Vancura does not disclose that either a non-bonus gaming event or a bonus triggering event in the primary slot machine determines the outcome of the bonus game. In *Vancura*, the outcome of the bonus game is determined by the accumulated winnings earned by the player during play of the bonus game and whether the player obtains a predetermined number of end game symbols before reaching the end of the game. *Vancura*, column 3, line 27 through column 4, line 29. The outcome of each variation of the bonus game in the secondary slot machine is based on events that occur in the bonus game itself and not on the events of the primary slot machine. Even if *Vancura* discloses that the gaming events of the primary slot machine ultimately determine whether or not a bonus game on the secondary slot machine is played, an outcome in the primary game does not determine the outcome of the bonus game in the secondary slot machine. Therefore, *Vancura* does not disclose an outcome of a second game that is only determined by an outcome of a first game as recited in Claim 22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 22 to 25 are in condition for allowance.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance and, in the absence of more pertinent art, such action is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY



Adam H. Masia
Reg. No. 35,602
Customer No. 29159

Dated: October 23, 2007